

was to run only as far as our territories extended, it did

cross the mountains, because we had no territory to the west of them. The Senator would have had to abandon all rights to territory in Oregon at all or he could not have clear of this line, or we should have been thrown exclusively on the Spanish title, since obtained. The discovery of gold would have been cut off; the exploration by Lewis and Clark would have been cut off; the rights and possessions of the American Fur Company would have been cut off—all

establishments west of the mountains—Mr. Henry's discovery of the South Pass—every thing we had there before 7, would have been cut off. These are the positions I ; and they amount, in fact, to the whole thing in dispute. The Senator from Michigan cannot escape: he never can

that the position in which he has placed himself. He says that he is a resident of the Territory west of the Rocky Mountains, and that he is a resident of the Territory west of the Rocky Mountains up to 1807. The inference is that he is a resident of the Territory west of the Rocky Mountains up to 1807. It cannot be denied; it cannot be escaped from; it is all perfectly fair and just, and he cannot get out of it.

Mr. Jefferson wished to follow the line of Utrecht indefinitely west; and I take it he knew about as much of the political history of the world, and of all connected with America particularly, as any man of his living. This point I therefore admit as conclusively established. This point I therefore admit as conclusively established. In denying that the line of the article could cross the line of the province omitted, he denies that we then had any territory beyond mountains; and for the line to go so far as our territories ended.

But, coming to the next, the Senator says that Mr. Monroe proposed no list of authorities to Lord Rowley. But he does not demand a list of authorities to prove Mr. Monroe's assertion that the line was established by the treaty under treaty of Utrecht, he must first show that Lord Rowley, British Secretary of State, disputed or denied the fact. If parties have opposite interests in a disputed matter, and of them brings forward a fact bearing on the claims or interests of the other, before he brings out his proofs to establish

He will wait to see if it is defied, and if not, where is the use of parading his proofs? Mr. Monroe says the commission did meet, and did establish a boundary line, running with along the parallel of 49 indefinitely to the west; and has stated this in a verbal interview with the Minister, for later security he afterwards reduces it to writing and submits it to him. Did Lord Harrowby deny the fact? *That* he question. Did he dispute the fact? Did he urge the best objection to the assertion—he whose Government had a party to the treaty in question, and had concurred in establishing the very line? *Never!* He admitted the whole! and yet it is objected that we find Mr. Monroe urging no list of authorities to prove what was admitted!

But here the honorable Senator has been guilty of an egre-

us non sequitur. He says that, because Mr. Monroe used same language respecting the establishment of this line t Douglass does, *therefore* he followed Douglass. Now, *ergo* in the case seems to me rather to be, since Monroe

Douglass used the same language in regard to the same thing, they must both have borrowed from the same source, that to which Mr. Madison had referred Mr. Monroe, and was the proceedings of the commissaries—the official records of the British Government. The Senator says that Mr. Madison did not know whether such a line ever had been run; Mr. Madison had the benefit of all the publicity of such a thing, and all official means of knowing it. He assumes the fact, and that is the only way in which he can show that

Mr. Jefferson, besides his being one of the commissioners sent to Europe in 1785, was in Paris the same day, was President of the United States. He had himself been in Europe, and while in Paris it was his well known custom to spend his evenings in the libraries and bookstores of that city, searching all he could find which had any bearing on this country.

Mr. Madison, under his direction, and acting as his Secretary of State, assumes the fact that the commissaries had done so, and had had "*proceedings*" in reference to the line, and sent a paper, with memorandums and marginal notes, (which is not now to be found,) containing doubtless the opinions by which he was to make good his argument from the fact. Who drew up the paper Mr. Madison does not say, but it is highly probable it was Mr. Jefferson himself.

giving these instructions, he knew and felt that he had
a soft and delicate ground to tread; and he therefore sent him
the suggestions which might aid him in making himself
master of his facts before he relied upon them in argument.
Mr. Monroe did add to what Mr. Madison had told him; he
gave the particulars respecting the line, and undoubtedly he
had access to the records of their proceedings then in London.
It is supposed that such men—and I do but perform a
duty and obey a patriotic impulse while I speak with defer-
ence—therefore, as I could not get so far

ator seems to think that they did in a matter of this weight and consequence? There never have been since their day, more able, more calm, more just, more

et al., more laborious, more sagacious, or more patriotic, than those who steered us through the storm of the Revolution, and formed the Government under which we live. There are doubtless in our army men whose deeds of valor entitle them to an eternal renown; but for years past my attention

in a particular manner been turned to the acts of those who conducted the political part of the Revolution; and I am prepared to say that men more wise, more devoted, more careless of themselves, or more careful to do nothing but what was right before God and man, never were granted to a nation in the hour of its greatest necessity.

The men of whom I have been speaking in connexion with the present question, were men of the Revolution. It was Jenson who directed Madison what to write; it was Madison who directed Monroe what to do and say. These men it is to say that the line of 49th was established by commissioners after the treaty of Utrecht, and directed Monroe to seek for

particulars in the proceedings of the commissaries, to be read in London. And is it at this day to be admitted; and is it to be repeated here by an American Senator, on such authority as Greenhow; and is an American Senate to sit and hear it; or can any American bring himself to suppose, that Messrs. Monroe, an American Minister thus instructed, a man of the utmost labor—a man of whom I have heard it said that he carried his office with him, wherever he went—in the so-

traveled his vince about nine wherever he went—in the solitude of the woods, in his walks, in his rides—and was so occupied, so engrossed by his business, that it never was out of his mind—that such a man as this would go to the English Court and be like a beau Dawson, and, instead of going to the proceedings of the commissaries, as instructed, should have recourse to a map published in Boston—would find his official assertions and arguments to Lord Harrowby on a map made in Boston? No. It was not by comparing piles of maps that

was to convince Lord Hawkebury. How could it be expected that he should make a parade of authorities when the British Minister admitted the fact and all its consequences at the first interview? Such presumptions are not to be tolerated. The Senator contends that the map produced from Posteliet, though constructed by D'Anville and dedicated to the Duke of Orleans, is of no authority, because it contains a note stating that the east end of the line, the east end of James's street, is incorrect. But how does that inference follow? The inference was the other way: that all is admitted to be correct except the part objected to of the line—the residue was correct.

now repeat my position, that I spoke in vindication of history—of the truths of history—and of the intelligence of the Senate, and in refutation of the impeachment of such men as Jefferson and Madison and Monroe in a book by one Mr. Sewar—*a book approved and vouched for by the Senator*—and I have been denied that the commissioners were appointed under the treaty of Utrecht, and that they establish the line of 49 as a boundary between the French and English possessions—a denial which I understood to be *denied by the Senator himself*.

I knew that it would be an impeachment on the intelligence of the Senate to let such a statement go any further. What I told the members of this body should be ignorant of the pretenses and history of a treaty which put an end to the war between Queen Anne and Louis XIV, which established the

at landmarks which have been guides to the policy of nations ever since? I could not consent that our character should go to the world branded with ignorance like this. The author endorsed the book, and this would give it currency in Europe as if it were an authority on which we relied. It is due to the Senate and to the American character to show

that such a conclusion would be utterly unfounded, and that the book was entirely erroneous touching so great a fact as

establishment of a boundary under that treaty between British and the French possessions in America. As to the question of Oregon I have not touched it, nor will I at present. The time has not yet come. I expressly said, after I had established the fact of the boundary, that I had have nothing to do with its application. I say that the error in which the Senator commented on Greenhow's book led me to believe that I should correct the error into which I had fallen. To do that I produced authorities bearing directly on that point—authorities not "recently met with," known and examined by me twenty years ago. Then, I began, I had to go on to the end; and this brought me

Mr. Jefferson, and to the great fact that Mr. Jefferson purchased the line of 49 as a boundary as far west as the limits of the territories extended. When I got there I thought I had to a place of shelter. With Jefferson before us—the discoverer, the political father of Oregon and its great, the line which he agreed to might well be agreed to by us.

It had two points in view—one was to show that Mr. Jefferson was in favor of carrying this boundary of 49 into Oregon and to the Pacific, and the other was to show that Mr. Monroe was under no necessity to produce the proof of the

of the commissaries, because Lord Harrowby seems at
to have admitted the line.

Mr. WEBSTER said that he wished those gentlemen who
posed to go into the history of this matter (which he did
to turn their attention to two questions which he would
ask.

It was certain that, by the tenth article of the treaty of
Utrecht, it was provided that commissaries should be appoint-
ed to determine a line of separation between the French and
English possessions in the northern part of the continent of